1	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS		
2	FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT		
3	SUMMARY ORDER		
4	THIS SUMMARY ORDER WILL NOT BE PUBLISHED IN THE FEDERAL		
5	REPORTER AND MAY NOT BE CITED AS PRECEDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO		
6	THIS OR ANY OTHER COURT, BUT MAY BE CALLED TO THE ATTENTION		
7	OF THIS OR ANY OTHER COURT IN A SUBSEQUENT STAGE OF THIS		
8 9	CASE, IN A RELATED CASE, OR IN ANY CASE FOR PURPOSES OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL OR RES JUDICATA.		
,	COLLAIERAL ESTOFFEL OR RES CODICATA.		
10	At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals		
11	for the Second Circuit, held at the Daniel Patrick Moynihan		
12	United States Courthouse, 500 Pearl Street, in the City of		
13	New York, on the 15th day of September, two thousand and		
14	six.		
15	PRESENT: HON. RICHARD J. CARDAMONE,		
16	HON. ROGER J. MINER,		
17	HON. ROGER U. MINER, HON. DENNIS JACOBS,		
1 /	HON. DENNIS UNCODS,		
18	<u>Circuit Judges</u> ,		
19	X		
20	WANDA SMIAROWSKI,		
21			
21	Plaintiff-Appellant,		
22			
23	No. 05 (250 am		
24	-v No. 05-6259-cv		
25	PHILLIP MORRIS USA,		
26			
27	<u>Defendant-Appellee</u> .		
28			
29	X		
-			

1			
2	APPEARING FOR APPELLEE:	ALLAN S. BLOOM, Paul, Hastings,	
3		Janofsky & Walker, LLP	
4		(Jacqueline M. Ceurvels, <u>on the</u>	
5		<pre>brief), New York, NY, for</pre>	
6		Appellee.	
7	Appeal from a judgment	of the United States	
8	District Court for the Southern District of New York		
9	(Castel, \underline{J} .), entered July 6, 2005.		
10	UPON DUE CONSIDERATION, it is ORDERED, ADJUDGED,		
11 12	AND DECREED that the judgme AFFIRMED.	ent of the district court is	
13	Plaintiff Wanda Smiarowski claims that defendant		
14	discriminated against her on the basis of age in		
15 16	declining to interview or hire her. We assume		
17	familiarity with the facts, the procedural history, and the issues on appeal. This Court reviews a grant of		
18	summary judgment <u>de novo</u> . <u>Mackey v. Bd. of Educ.</u> , 386		
19	F.3d 158, 163 (2d Cir. 2004).		
20	To survive summary judgment, Smiarowski must		
21	establish a <u>prima facie</u> discrimination case by		
22	adducing facts or circumstances giving rise to an		
23	inference of discrimination. Defendant's request for		
24	plaintiff's year of entry into the workforcea		
25	question bearing on work experiencedoes not alone		
26	support such an inference.		
27	For the foregoing reasons, the judgment of the		
28 29	district court is affirmed.		
30		FOR THE COURT:	
31		ROSEANN B. MACKECHNIE, CLERK	
32		By:	
33			
34		Richard Alcantara, Deputy Clerk	